arXiv:1503.02755v3 [math.AC] 5 May 2015

THE DEGREE SEQUENCE OF IDEALS AND MULTIPLICITIES

Duong Quoc Viet
Department of Mathematics, Hanoi National University of Education
136 Xuan Thuy street, Hanoi, Vietnam
duongquocviet@fmail.vnn.vn

ABSTRACT: This paper investigates the relationship between multiplicities and the degree sequence of ideals in graded algebras, gives multiplicity equations of graded rings via the degree sequence of ideals, and characterizes mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings in terms of the degree sequence of ideals. As an application, the paper answered an open question on the multiplicity of Rees rings.

1 Introduction

Establishment of formulas for calculating multiplicities is always an interesting problem and attracted much attention. Let $S = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} S_n$ be a finitely generated standard $\mathbb{N}$-graded algebra over an infinite field k. Denote by $\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal homogeneous ideal of S. It is well-known that if $c_1 \leq \cdots \leq c_t$ are the degrees of the elements of an arbitrary homogeneous minimal basis of a homogeneous ideal I then the sequence $(c_1, \ldots, c_t)$ does not depend upon the choice of the homogeneous minimal basis, and this sequence is called the *degree sequence* of I.

Let I be an ideal of S. One always want to know the relationship between multiplicities of objects arising from I and the degree sequence of I.

In fact, Herzog, Trung, Ulrich in 1992 [7] started the investigation of the multiplicity of blow-up rings of ideals generated by d-sequences in terms of the degree sequence.

We would like now to begin with mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings $R(I)$ of homogeneous ideals I generated by a subsystems of parameters. This problem originated from a paper of Trung in 1993 [20, Theorem 3.3] by the following.

This research was in part supported by a grant from NAFOSTED.

Mathematics Subject Classification(2010): Primary 13H15. Secondary 14C17, 13D40, 13C15.

Key words and phrases: The degree sequence, multiplicity, mixed multiplicity, (FC)-sequence.

Theorem 1.1 ([20])**.** *Let I be a homogeneous ideal generated by a subsystem of parameters $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ which is an I-filter-regular sequence with* $\deg x_1 \leq \cdots \leq \deg x_h$. *Denote by $(a_1, \ldots, a_h)$ the degree sequence of I. Then $e(R(I)) = (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} a_1 \cdots a_i)e(S)$.*

By using weak-(FC)-sequences in [24](see e.g. [4, 5, 36]), Viet in 2003 [27] obtained formulas for mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings of arbitrary homogeneous equimultiple ideals in S, i.e, the additional condition on the generation of I in Theorem 1.1 has been dropped. We emphasize that the proof of [27] is based on the existence of homogeneous weak-(FC)-elements in I as in Lemma 3.1. However, this is not correct (see Remark 3.3). So the results in [27] are not yet proven. And [21] in 2010 gave the following open question which has also been stated in [20] in 1993.

Question 1 [21, Question 7.7]**.** *Can one drop the condition* $\deg x_1 \leq \cdots \leq \deg x_h$ *in Theorem 1.1*?

It has long been known that the approach, which based on the existence of sequences of homogeneous elements, encountered obstructions in the progress of calculating multiplicities. This is one of motivations to help us giving another approach for this problem. Our approach is started by the construction of the following object.

Note that for any non-zero element x of S, one can always write uniquely in the form $x = x_{m_1} + \cdots + x_{m_t}$, here $m_1 < \cdots < m_t$ and $0 \neq x_{m_i} \in S_{m_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$, then we put $\mathrm{in}x = x_{m_1}$ and $o(x) = m_1$. Let I be an ideal of S. Denote by $\mathrm{in}I$ the ideal generated by $\{\mathrm{in}x \mid x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I\}$. Then the degree sequence of $\mathrm{in}I$ is called the *degree sequence* of I. Proposition 2.4 showed the existence of minimal bases $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of I such that $(o(x_1), \ldots, o(x_n))$ is the degree sequence of I.

This paper examines the relationship between multiplicities of ideals in graded algebras and the degree sequence of ideals, hereby answers Question 1. And as one might expect, we first obtain the following result for the Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity of graded domains, in terms of the degree sequence of ideals.

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 2.9)**.** *Let $S = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} S_n$ be a finitely generated standard $\mathbb{N}$-graded algebra over an infinite field k of* $\dim S = d > 0$. *Let I be an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal of S. Assume that S is a domain and $(c_1, \ldots, c_d)$ is the degree sequence of a minimal reduction of I. Then we have $e(I; S) = c_1 \cdots c_d e(S)$.*

It should be noted that this theorem does not hold in general if one omits the condition that S is a domain (see Remark 2.10).

However, using this theorem as a tool we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 2.11)**.** *Let $S = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} S_n$ be a finitely generated standard $\mathbb{N}$-graded algebra over an infinite field k of* $\dim S = d > 0$. *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ be a system of parameters of S. Assume that* $\mathrm{in}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_d$ *is a system of parameters of S. Then we have $e(x_1, \ldots, x_d; S) = o(x_1) \cdots o(x_d)e(S)$.*

Theorem 1.3 seems to become an effective support for characterizing multiplicities in terms of the degree sequence of ideals. In fact, Theorem 1.3 yielded the interesting applications for mixed multiplicities (see Theorem 2.15 and Corollary 2.16).

Further, by using Theorem 1.3 and Lemma 3.1 we immediately answered to the Question 1 by the following result.

Corollary 1.4 (Corollary 3.2)**.** *Let I be a homogeneous equimultiple ideal in a standard graded algebra S of $\mathrm{ht} I = h > 0$. Let $(a_1, \ldots, a_h)$ be the degree sequence of a homogeneous minimal reduction of I. Set $\dim S = d$. Denote by $e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S)$ the mixed multiplicity of $(I, \mathfrak{m})$ of the type $(i, d-i)$ for $i \leq d-1$. Then we have:*

(i) $e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = a_1 \cdots a_i e(S)$ *for all* $i \leq h-1$.

(ii) $e(R(I)) = (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} a_1 \cdots a_i) e(S)$.

Corollary 1.4 is also Theorem 3.1 given by Viet in [27]. So by another approach, the present paper showed that [27, Theorem 3.1] and hence the other results on mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings in [27] are true, and the Question 1 has a positive answer (see Remark 3.3).

Notice that Corollary 1.4 is a particular case of Corollary 2.16. And although in general there does not exist a homogeneous weak-(FC)-sequence in I as in Lemma 3.1, this lemma showed the existence of weak-(FC)-sequences in I having the same degree sequence as a homogeneous minimal reduction of I. This is an important property used for the proof of Corollary 1.4. The results of the paper showed the important role of the degree sequence in studying multiplicities of ideals.

This paper is divided into three sections. Section 2 is devoted to the discussion of the degree sequence of ideals (Proposition 2.2, Proposition 2.4) and multiplicities of graded algebras (Proposition 2.5, Corollary 2.7, Corollary 2.8, Theorem 2.9, Theorem 2.11). And as applications, we get results for mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings of ideals in graded rings (Theorem 2.15, Corollary 2.16). Section 3 investigates the relationship between the degree sequence of homogeneous equimultiple ideals and the degree sequence of weak-(FC)-sequences of these ideals (Lemma 3.1) that will be used in the proofs for results on mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings of homogeneous equimultiple ideals (Corollary 3.2, and Corollary 3.4). And Question 1 is answered by Corollary 3.2.

2 Multiplicities of Graded Rings

In this section, we first define some objects in graded rings, and study the relationship between multiplicities; mixed multiplicities of graded algebras and the degree sequence of ideals, give multiplicity formulas of graded rings; mixed multiplicity formulas and the multiplicity of Rees rings via the degree sequence of ideals.

Our approach is started by the construction of the following useful objects in standard $\mathbb{N}$-graded algebras.

Recall that $S = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} S_n$ is the finitely generated standard $\mathbb{N}$-graded algebra over an infinite field k, i.e., S is generated over k by elements of total degree 1, and $\mathfrak{m}$ the maximal homogeneous ideal of S. Then for any element $x \neq 0$ of S, one can always write uniquely in the form $x = x_{m_1} + \cdots + x_{m_t}$, here $m_1 < \cdots < m_t$ and $0 \neq x_{m_i} \in S_{m_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. In this case, we put $o(x) = m_1 = \deg x_{m_1}$ and $\mathrm{in} x = x_{m_1}$. Assign $\mathrm{in} 0 = 0$; $o(0) = +\infty$. Set $o(U) = \min\{o(x) \mid x \in U\}$ for any $U \subset S$.

Let $b_1, \ldots, b_n \in S_1$ be a minimal basis of $\mathfrak{m}$ and fix this order. Set $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_n)$; $|\mathbf{m}| = m_1 + \cdots + m_n$ and $\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}} = b_1^{m_1} \cdots b_n^{m_n}$ for any $(m_1, \ldots, m_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$. It is obvious that $S = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}^n} k\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}}$. And it is a plain fact that $C_u = \{\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}} \mid |\mathbf{m}| = u\}$ generates $\mathfrak{m}^u$ for any $u > 0$. Then for any $u > 0$, one can choose a minimal basis $B_u \subset C_u$ of $\mathfrak{m}^u$, and fix this basis. Set $B_0 = \{1\}$. Then

$$S = \bigoplus_{u \geq 0} \Big(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}} \in B_u} k\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}} \Big) \text{ and } \mathfrak{m} = \bigoplus_{u > 0} \Big(\bigoplus_{\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}} \in B_u} k\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}} \Big).$$

Now we define an order on $\mathbb{N}^n$ as follows: $\mathbf{m} < \mathbf{m}'$ if the first non-zero component from the left side of $(|\mathbf{m}| - |\mathbf{m}'|, m_1 - m_1', \ldots, m_n - m_n')$ is negative.

Note that each non-zero element x of S can always be written uniquely in the form $x = \sum_{\mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}} \in \bigcup_{u \geq 0} B_u} x_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{m}}$, where $x_{\mathbf{m}} \in k$ and there are only finitely many $\mathbf{m}$ such that $x_{\mathbf{m}} \neq 0$, in this case, set $x^* = \mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{v}}$ if $\mathbf{v} = \min\{\mathbf{m} \mid x_{\mathbf{m}} \neq 0\}$. Assign $0^* = 0$. Denote by I^* the ideal generated by $\{x^* \mid x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I\}$ for any ideal I of S.

For any homogeneous ideal I of S, it is well-known that if $c_1 \leq \cdots \leq c_t$ are the degrees of the elements of an arbitrary homogeneous minimal basis of I, then the sequence $(c_1, \ldots, c_t)$ does not depend on the choice of the minimal basis, and this sequence is called the *degree sequence* of I. The case of an arbitrary ideal I of S, denote by $\mathrm{in} I$ the ideal generated by $\{\mathrm{in} x \mid x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I\}$. Then the degree sequence of $\mathrm{in} I$ is called the *degree sequence* of I. Denote by $\mu(I)$ the minimal number of generators of I.

Remark 2.1. If I is a homogeneous ideal, then I has homogeneous minimal bases. So it is easy to check that $\mathrm{in} I = I$. Hence the above notion of the degree sequence is an extension of the ordinary notion of the degree sequence for homogeneous ideals.

Further, the relationship between I; $\mathrm{in} I$ and I^* is shown by the following lemma.

Proposition 2.2. *Let I be an ideal of S. We have the following statements.*

(i) $\mu(I^*) = \mu(I) = \mu(\mathrm{in} I)$.

(ii) *There exists a minimal basis $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of I such that* $\mathrm{in} x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in} x_n$ *and $x_1^*, \ldots, x_n^*$ are minimal bases of* $\mathrm{in} I$ *and I^*, respectively.*

(iii) *The degree sequences of I and I^* are the same.*

Proof. Now assume that $\mu(I) = n$. Then there exist $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I$ such that $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is a minimal basis of I. And without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathbf{v}_1 \leq \cdots \leq \mathbf{v}_d$, here $x_i^* = \mathbf{b}^{\mathbf{v}_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Notice that if $x_i^* = x_{i+1}^*$ and

$$x_i = a x_i^* + \cdots ; \;\; x_{i+1} = b x_{i+1}^* + \cdots$$

for $0 \neq a, b \in k$, then one can replace x_{i+1} by $y_{i+1} = x_{i+1} - ba^{-1}x_i$ for any $1 \leq i < n$. Then we get a minimal basis $y_1, \dots, y_n$ of I such that $y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*$ are pairwise distinct. Consequently, we can assume that $x_1, \dots, x_n$ is a minimal basis of I with $x_i^* \neq x_j^*$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$. Set $X = \{x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*\}$. Let $x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I$. Since $x_1, \dots, x_n$ is a minimal basis of I, it follows that $x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i + y$, here $a_1, \dots, a_n \in k$ and $y \in \mathfrak{m}I$. Since $y \in \mathfrak{m}I$, it follows that $y^* \notin X \cup \{x^*\}$. Because $x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*$ are pairwise distinct, we get $x^* = x_i^*$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. Hence $x^* \in X$. So $X = \{x^* \mid x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I\}$. Therefore I^* is generated by X. Now since $x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*$ are pairwise distinct, it follows that $x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*$ are k-linearly independent. Therefore $\mu(I^*) = n$, and $x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*$ is a minimal basis of I^*. Next, set $\mathrm{in} x_i = z_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then we have $x_i^* = z_i^*$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. So $az_i \neq bz_j$ for all $0 \neq a, b \in k$ and $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$.

Set $Y = \{x \neq 0 \mid x = az_j;\ a \in k;\ 1 \leq j \leq n\}$. Then for any $x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I$, since $x_1, \dots, x_n$ is a minimal basis of I, we get $x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i + y$, here $a_1, \dots, a_n \in k$ and $y \in \mathfrak{m}I$. Since $y \in \mathfrak{m}I$, it follows that $\mathrm{in} y \notin Y \cup \{a \mathrm{in} x\}$ for all $0 \neq a \in k$. Then since $az_i \neq bz_j$ for all $0 \neq a, b \in k$ and $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, we obtain $\mathrm{in} x = az_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $a \in k$. So $\mathrm{in} x \in Y$. We get $Y = \{\mathrm{in} x \mid x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I\}$. Hence $\mathrm{in} I = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$. Recall that $az_i \neq bz_j$ for all $0 \neq a, b \in k$ and $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, it follows that $z_1, \dots, z_n$ are k-linearly independent. Thus $\mu(\mathrm{in} I) = n$ and $\mathrm{in} x_1, \dots, \mathrm{in} x_n$ is a minimal basis of $\mathrm{in} I$. We get (i) and (ii). By (ii) we immediately obtain (iii). □

Remark 2.3. From the proof of Proposition 2.2, it follows that $X = \{x^* \mid x \in I \setminus \mathfrak{m}I\}$ is a minimal basis of I^* and $\mu(I) = |X|$ for any ideal I of S. Moreover, if $x_1, \dots, x_n$ is a minimal basis of I such that $x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*$ are pairwise distinct, then $\mathrm{in} x_1, \dots, \mathrm{in} x_n$ and $x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*$ are minimal bases of $\mathrm{in} I$ and I^*, respectively. Since $o(x_i) = \deg \mathrm{in} x_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, hence the degree of I is a permutation of $o(x_1), \dots, o(x_n)$. In fact, as the proof of Proposition 2.2, one also follow that if $x_1, \dots, x_n$ is a minimal basis of I such that $a \mathrm{in} x_i \neq b \mathrm{in} x_j$ for all $0 \neq a, b \in k$ and $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, then $\mathrm{in} x_1, \dots, \mathrm{in} x_n$ is a minimal basis of $\mathrm{in} I$. And in this case, the degree sequence of I is a permutation of $o(x_1), \dots, o(x_n)$.

Remark 2.3 yields the following conclusion.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be a minimal basis of I with $o(x_1) \leq \cdots \leq o(x_n)$ and $x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*$ pairwise distinct. Set $o(x_i) = c_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then the sequence $(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ does not depend on the choice of this minimal basis, and this sequence is the degree sequence of I.*

The following result is an important tool of this paper.

Proposition 2.5. *Let I be an ideal of S. Assume that S is a domain. Then we have*

$$e(S/I) = e(S/\mathrm{in} I).$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.2, there exists a minimal basis $x_1, \dots, x_n$ of I such that $\mathrm{in} x_1, \dots, \mathrm{in} x_n$ is a minimal basis of $\mathrm{in} I$. Let x be an element of I. Then $x = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i x_i$ for certain elements $y_1, \dots, y_n \in S$. Since S is a domain, it follows that $\mathrm{in} x = \mathrm{in} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \mathrm{in} x_i$. Hence $\mathrm{in} x \in \mathrm{in} I$ for all $x \in I$. Any $z = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathrm{in} x_i \in \mathrm{in} I$ for $z_1, \dots, z_n \in S$, we have

$$\mathrm{in} z = \mathrm{in} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i \mathrm{in} x_i = \mathrm{in} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i x_i$$

since S is a domain. Note that $u = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i x_i \in I$. So $\mathrm{in} z = \mathrm{in} u$ for some $u \in I$. From this it follows that

$$\{\mathrm{in} x \mid x \in I\} = \{\mathrm{in} x \mid x \in \mathrm{in} I\}.$$

Hence we have

$$\{\mathrm{in} x \mid x \in I\} \bigcap S_m + \bigoplus_{n \geq m+1} S_n = \{\mathrm{in} x \mid x \in \mathrm{in} I\} \bigcap S_m + \bigoplus_{n \geq m+1} S_n$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, it is plain that

$$\{\mathrm{in} x \mid x \in I\} \bigcap S_m + \bigoplus_{n \geq m+1} S_n = I \bigcap [\bigoplus_{n \geq m} S_n] + \bigoplus_{n \geq m+1} S_n$$

and $\{\mathrm{in} x \mid x \in \mathrm{in} I\} \bigcap S_m + \bigoplus_{n \geq m+1} S_n = \mathrm{in} I \bigcap [\bigoplus_{n \geq m} S_n] + \bigoplus_{n \geq m+1} S_n$. So

$$\bigoplus_{n \geq m+1} S_n + I \bigcap [\bigoplus_{n \geq m} S_n] = \bigoplus_{n \geq m+1} S_n + \mathrm{in} I \bigcap [\bigoplus_{n \geq m} S_n]$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Now since $\mathfrak{m}^m = \bigoplus_{n \geq m} S_n$, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{m}^{m+1} + I \bigcap \mathfrak{m}^m = \mathfrak{m}^{m+1} + \mathrm{in} I \bigcap \mathfrak{m}^m \tag{1}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Denote by $F = \{\mathfrak{m}^m\}_{m \geq 0}$ the $\mathfrak{m}$-adic filtration of S, and denote by

$$gr_F(S/I) = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} (\mathfrak{m}^m (S/I) / \mathfrak{m}^{m+1} (S/I))$$

the associated graded module of the S-module S/I with respect to the filtration F. It can be verified that

$$gr_F(S/I) \cong \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} (\mathfrak{m}^m + I / \mathfrak{m}^{m+1} + I) \cong \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} (\mathfrak{m}^m / (\mathfrak{m}^{m+1} + I \cap \mathfrak{m}^m)).$$

Hence by (1) we get

$$gr_F(S/I) \cong gr_F(S/\mathrm{in} I).$$

Note that $e(S/I) = e(gr_F(S/I))$, thus $e(S/I) = e(S/\mathrm{in} I)$. □

The proof of Proposition 2.5 yields the following comment.

Remark 2.6. Let S be a domain. Recall that we have

$$\{\mathrm{in}x \mid x \in E\} = \{\mathrm{in}x \mid x \in \mathrm{in}E\}$$

for any ideal E of S by the proof of Proposition 2.5. And it is a simple master to give examples that this equation is not true in general if S is not a domain. Note that $\mathrm{in}E$ is a homogeneous ideal, we obtain $\{\mathrm{in}x \mid x \in \mathrm{in}E\} \subset \mathrm{in}E$. So $\{\mathrm{in}x \mid x \in E\} \subset \mathrm{in}E$. Next, we would like to give an example to show that this inclusion is not true in general if S is not a domain.

Let $S = k[X, Y]/(XY, X^2)$, here k is a field and X and Y are variables. Then S is not a domain. Denote by $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ the images of X and Y in S, respectively. Let $x = \bar{X} + \bar{Y}^2$ be an element of S. Set $E = (x)$. Then $\mathrm{in}E = (\bar{X})$ and $y = x^2 = \bar{Y}^4 \in E$. However $\mathrm{in}y = \bar{Y}^4 \notin \mathrm{in}E$.

The following corollaries of Proposition 2.5 are a pivotal connection for the approach of the paper, and which are proven to be useful in this paper.

Let I be an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal, and let S be a domain. Then $\mathfrak{m}^u \subset I$ for a certain integer $u > 0$. From this it follows that $\{\mathrm{in}x \mid x \in \mathfrak{m}^u\} \subset \{\mathrm{in}x \mid x \in I\} \subset \mathrm{in}I$ by Remark 2.6. So we get $\mathrm{in}\mathfrak{m}^u \subset \mathrm{in}I$. Since $\mathfrak{m}^u$ is a homogeneous ideal, $\mathrm{in}\mathfrak{m}^u = \mathfrak{m}^u$ by Remark 2.1. Hence $\sqrt{\mathrm{in}\mathfrak{m}^u} = \mathfrak{m}$. Consequently $\mathrm{in}I$ is an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal of S. By Proposition 2.5, we have

$$e(S/I) = e(S/\mathrm{in}I).$$

Note that I and $\mathrm{in}I$ are $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideals, it follows that S/I and $S/\mathrm{in}I$ are Artinian rings. Hence $e(S/I) = \ell(S/I)$ and $e(S/\mathrm{in}I) = \ell(S/\mathrm{in}I)$. Thus

$$\ell(S/I) = \ell(S/\mathrm{in}I).$$

Hence we get the following result.

Corollary 2.7. *Let I be an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal of S. Assume that S is a domain. Then $\mathrm{in}I$ is an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal of S and $\ell(S/I) = \ell(S/\mathrm{in}I)$.*

Now assume that S is a domain with $\dim S = d > 0$ and q is a parameter ideal of S. By Proposition 2.2, there exists a minimal basis $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ of q such that $\mathrm{in}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_d$ is a minimal basis of $\mathrm{in}q$. Note that $\mathrm{in}q$ is an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal of S by Corollary 2.7. So $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ and $\mathrm{in}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_d$ are systems of parameters of S. Hence these systems are algebraically independent over k (see e.g. [1, Corollary 11.21]). Therefore it can be verified that

$$\{\mathrm{in}x_1^{n_1} \cdots \mathrm{in}x_d^{n_d} = \mathrm{in}[x_1^{n_1} \cdots x_d^{n_d}] \mid n_1 + \cdots + n_d = n\}$$

is a minimal basis of $\mathrm{in}q^n$. So $\mathrm{in}q^n = (\mathrm{in}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_d)^n = (\mathrm{in}q)^n$ for all $n > 0$. Then by Corollary 2.7, we get

$$\ell(S/q^n) = \ell(S/(\mathrm{in}q)^n)$$

for all $n > 0$. Consequently

$$e(q; S) = e(\mathrm{in}q; S).$$

These comments yield:

Corollary 2.8. *Assume that S is a domain and q is a parameter ideal of S. Then* in$q$ *is a parameter ideal of S and $e(q;S) = e(\mathrm{in}q;S)$.*

Let I be an ideal of a Noetherian local ring $(A, \mathfrak{n})$ with the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n}$. An ideal J is called a *reduction* of an ideal I if $J \subseteq I$ and $I^{n+1} = JI^n$ for some n. A reduction J is called a *minimal reduction* of I if it does not properly contain any other reduction of I [15]. Set $\ell(I) = \dim \bigoplus\limits_{n\geq 0}(I^n/\mathfrak{n}I^n)$. Then one called $\ell(I)$ the *analytic spread* of I. If the residue field $k = A/\mathfrak{n}$ is infinite, then the minimal number of generators of every minimal reduction of I is equal to $\ell(I)$ [15]. It is well known that $\mathrm{ht}I \leq \ell(I) \leq \dim A$, and I is called an *equimultiple ideal* if $\ell(I) = \mathrm{ht}I$.

The following result will play a crucial role in the approach of this paper.

Theorem 2.9. *Let $S = \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} S_n$ be a finitely generated standard $\mathbb{N}$-graded algebra over an infinite field k of $\dim S = d > 0$. Let I be an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal of S. Assume that S is a domain and $(c_1, \ldots, c_d)$ is the degree sequence of a minimal reduction of I. Then we have $e(I;S) = c_1 \cdots c_d e(S)$.*

Proof. Let J be a minimal reduction of I of the degree sequence $(c_1, \ldots, c_d)$. Note that since I is $\mathfrak{m}$-primary, it follows that $\ell(I) = \mathrm{ht}I = d$. Hence $\mu(J) = d$ and J is a parameter ideal of S. Recall that by Corollary 2.8, we have $e(J;S) = e(\mathrm{in}J;S)$. Since J is a minimal reduction of I, we obtain $e(I;S) = e(J;S)$ by [15, Theorem 1]. By Proposition 2.2, there exists a minimal basis $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ of J such that $\mathrm{in}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_d$ is a minimal basis of in$J$. Set $y_i = \mathrm{in}x_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Then $y_1, \ldots, y_d$ is a system of parameters for S, and one can consider the degree sequence of J as

$$(\deg y_1, \ldots, \deg y_d) = (c_1, \ldots, c_d).$$

Next we recall the following proof in [34, Lemma 3.3] for $e(\mathrm{in}J;S) = c_1 \cdots c_d e(S)$.

Put $c = c_1 \cdots c_d$ and $u_i = c/c_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Then we have $\deg y_i^{u_i} = c$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. So

$$\{{y_1}^{u_1}, \ldots, {y_d}^{u_d}\} \subset S_c.$$

From the above facts, we get

$$c^d e(S) = e(({y_1}^{u_1}, \ldots, {y_d}^{u_d});S) = u_1 \cdots u_d e((y_1, \ldots, y_d);S) = u_1 \cdots u_d e(\mathrm{in}J;S).$$

Consequently, $e(\mathrm{in}J;S) = c_1 \cdots c_d e(S)$. We get $e(I;S) = c_1 \cdots c_d e(S)$. ☐

Notice that when E is a homogeneous ideal generated by a subsystem of parameters of S and $(a_1, \ldots, a_h)$ is the degree sequence of E, upon special computations, Trung in [20] proved that

$$e(G(E)) = a_1 \cdots a_h e(S),$$

here $G(E) = \bigoplus_{n\geq 0}(E^n/E^{n+1})$ is the associated graded ring of E. Using this result, one can also get

$$e(\mathrm{in}J;S) = c_1 \cdots c_d e(S)$$

since $e(G(\mathrm{in}J)) = e(\mathrm{in}J;S)$.

Remark 2.10. From Theorem 2.9, one may raise a question: Does the theorem hold if S is not a domain? Consider the case $S = k[X,Y]/(XY, X^2)$, here k is a field and X and Y are variables (see Remark 2.6). Denote by $\bar{X}$ and $\bar{Y}$ the images of X and Y in S, respectively. Then it is easily seen that $\dim S = 1$; $e(S) = 1$ and $x = \bar{X} + \bar{Y}^2$ is a system of parameters for S; $x^2 = \bar{Y}^4$ and $o(x) = 1$. Now if Theorem 2.9 is true for S, then $e(x;S) = e(S)$. So $e(x^2;S) = 2e(S)$. Because $e(x^2;S) = e(\bar{Y}^4;S) = 4e(\bar{Y};S)$, $e(S) = 2e(\bar{Y};S)$. Hence $e(S) \neq 1$. This example shows that Theorem 2.9 does not hold in general if one omits the assumption that S is a domain.

However, using Theorem 2.9 we prove the following theorem for multiplicities of arbitrary $\mathbb{N}$-graded algebras.

Theorem 2.11. *Let $S = \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} S_n$ be a finitely generated standard $\mathbb{N}$-graded algebra over an infinite field k of $\dim S = d > 0$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ be a system of parameters of S. Assume that $\mathrm{in} x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in} x_d$ is a system of parameters of S. Then we have*

$$e(x_1, \ldots, x_d; S) = o(x_1)\cdots o(x_d)e(S).$$

Proof. Denote by Λ the set of minimal prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of S such that $\dim S/\mathfrak{p} = d$. For any $\mathfrak{p} \in \Lambda$, denote by $\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_d$ and $\overline{\mathrm{in} x_1}, \ldots, \overline{\mathrm{in} x_d}$ the images of $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ and $\mathrm{in} x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in} x_d$ in $S/\mathfrak{p}$, respectively. Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime ideal with $\dim S/\mathfrak{p} = d$, it follows that $\mathfrak{p}$ is a homogeneous ideal and $\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_d$ and $\overline{\mathrm{in} x_1}, \ldots, \overline{\mathrm{in} x_d}$ are systems of parameters of the graded algebra $S/\mathfrak{p}$. Note that $\overline{\mathrm{in} x_i} \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$, we get $\overline{\mathrm{in} x_i} = \mathrm{in}\bar{x}_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Since $\mathrm{in}\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}\bar{x}_d$ is a system of parameters of $S/\mathfrak{p}$, it follows that $a\mathrm{in}\bar{x}_i \neq b\mathrm{in}\bar{x}_j$ for all $0 \neq a, b \in k$ and $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$. Hence the degree sequence of $(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_d)$ is a permutation of $\deg \mathrm{in}\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \deg \bar{x}_d$ by Remark 2.3. Since $S/\mathfrak{p}$ is a domain, by Theorem 2.9 we get

$$e(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_d; S/\mathfrak{p}) = o(\bar{x}_1)\cdots o(\bar{x}_d)e(S/\mathfrak{p}).$$

Note that $o(\bar{x}_i) = o(x_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ and if consider $S/\mathfrak{p}$ as a S-module then

$$e(\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_d; S/\mathfrak{p}) = e_S(x_1, \ldots, x_d; S/\mathfrak{p}).$$

So $e_S(x_1, \ldots, x_d; S/\mathfrak{p}) = o(x_1)\cdots o(x_d)e(S/\mathfrak{p})$. Remember that

$$e(x_1, \ldots, x_d; S) = \sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Lambda} \ell(S_{\mathfrak{p}})e_S(x_1, \ldots, x_d; S/\mathfrak{p})$$

(see [9, Theorem 11.2.4]), we obtain

$$e(x_1, \ldots, x_d; S) = o(x_1)\cdots o(x_d)\sum_{\mathfrak{p}\in\Lambda} \ell(S_{\mathfrak{p}})e(S/\mathfrak{p}) = o(x_1)\cdots o(x_d)e(S).$$

Thus $e(x_1, \ldots, x_d; S) = o(x_1)\cdots o(x_d)e(S)$. □

We recall now the notion of weak-(FC)-sequences in [24]. This sequence is a kind of superficial sequences, and it has proven to be useful in several contexts (see e.g. [4, 5, 29, 36]).

Definition 2.12 ([24])**.** Let $(A, \mathfrak{n})$ be a Noetherian local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n}$. Let $I_1, \ldots, I_s$ be ideals of A such that $I = I_1 \cdots I_s$ is non-nilpotent. An element $x \in A$ is called a *weak*-(FC)-*element* of $(I_1, \ldots, I_s)$ if there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ such that $x \in I_i$ and the following conditions are satisfied:

(FC1): For all large n_i and for all $n_1, \ldots, n_{i-1}, n_{i+1}, \ldots, n_s \geq 0$,

$$(x) \bigcap I_1^{n_1} \cdots I_i^{n_i+1} \cdots I_s^{n_s} = x I_1^{n_1} \cdots I_i^{n_i} \cdots I_s^{n_s}.$$

(FC2): x is an I-filter-regular element, i.e., $0_A : x \subseteq 0_A : I^{\infty}$.

Let $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ be elements of A. For any $0 \leq i \leq t$, set $A_i = \dfrac{A}{(x_1, \ldots, x_i)}$. Then $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ is called a *weak*-(FC)-*sequence* of $(I_1, \ldots, I_s)$ if $\bar{x}_{i+1}$ (the image of x_{i+1} in A_i) is a weak-(FC)-element of $(I_1 A_i, \ldots, I_s A_i)$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, t-1$. If a weak-(FC)-sequence consists of k_1 elements of $I_1, \ldots, k_s$ elements of I_s $(k_1, \ldots, k_s \geq 0)$, then it is called a weak-(FC)-sequence of $(I_1, \ldots, I_s)$ of *the type* $(k_1, \ldots, k_s)$. A weak-(FC)-sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ is called a *maximal weak-(FC)-sequence* if $I \subseteq \sqrt{(x_1, \ldots, x_t)}$.

Let $\mathfrak{J}$ be $\mathfrak{n}$-primary and I a non-nilpotent ideal of A. By using Rees'lemma in [16], one (see e.g. [25, 26, 28, 29]) showed that if I is non-nilpotent, the length of any maximal weak-(FC)-sequence in I with respect to $(I, \mathfrak{J})$ is equal to $\ell(I) = \ell$ and if $x_1, \ldots, x_\ell$ is a weak-(FC)-sequence in I with respect to $(I, \mathfrak{J})$, then $(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell)$ is a minimal reduction of I. Moreover, as in the proof of Theorem 3.3 [25], then any minimal reduction of I is generated by a maximal weak-(FC)-sequence in I with respect to $(I, \mathfrak{J})$ (see e.g. [30, 34, 35]).

Before giving the results in the rest of this section, we need the following lemma on the relationship between minimal reductions and maximal weak-(FC)-sequences.

Lemma 2.13. *Let I be a non-nilpotent ideal of $(A, \mathfrak{n})$ and J a minimal reduction of I. Then J is generated by a weak-(FC)-sequence of length $\ell(I)$ in J of $(J, \mathfrak{n})$ and this sequence is also a weak-(FC)-sequence in I of $(I, \mathfrak{n})$.*

Proof. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_p$ be a maximal weak-(FC)-sequence in J of $(J, I, \mathfrak{n})$. Since J is a reduction of I, it easily follows that $x_1, \ldots, x_p$ is a weak-(FC)-sequence of $(J, \mathfrak{n})$, and $x_1, \ldots, x_p$ is also a weak-(FC)-sequence of $(I, \mathfrak{n})$.

By induction on $i \leq p$, we prove that

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_i) \bigcap J^{n+1} I^m = (x_1, \ldots, x_i) J^n I^m$$

for all large n and $m \geq 0$. The case of $i = 0$ is trivial. Set $q = (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1})$ and $A' = A/q$. Denote by x_i' the image of x_i in A'. Now suppose that the result has been proved for $i-1 \geq 0$. Since x'_i in JA' is a weak-(FC)-element of $(JA', IA', \mathfrak{n}A')$,

$$(x'_i) \bigcap J^{n+1}I^m A' = x'_i J^n I^m A'$$

for all large n and $m \geq 0$. So $[J^{n+1}I^m + q] \bigcap [(x_i) + q] = x_i J^n I^m + q$ for all large n and $m \geq 0$. Hence

$$J^{n+1}I^m \bigcap [(x_i) + q] = x_i J^n I^m + q \bigcap J^{n+1}I^m$$

for all large n and $m \geq 0$. By the inductive assumption, $q \bigcap J^{n+1}I^m = qJ^nI^m$ for all large n and $m \geq 0$. Hence

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_i) \bigcap J^{n+1}I^m = (x_1, \ldots, x_i)J^nI^m$$

for all large n and $m \geq 0$. The induction is complete. Consequently,

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_p) \bigcap J^{n+1}I^m = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)J^nI^m$$

for all large n and $m \geq 0$. Since $x_1, \ldots, x_p$ is a maximal weak-(FC)-sequence in J of $(J, I, \mathfrak{n})$, $J^{n+1}I^m \subset (x_1, \ldots, x_p)$ for all large n and $m \geq 0$. Thus

$$J^{n+1}I^m = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)J^nI^m$$

for all large n and $m \geq 0$. From this it follows that $(x_1, \ldots, x_p)$ is a reduction of both J and I. So $p \geq \ell(I)$. Note that $\ell(JI) = \ell(I)$, and moreover $p \leq \ell(JI)$ by [26, Theorem 3.4(iv)], we get $p = \ell(I)$. Hence $(x_1, \ldots, x_p)$ is a minimal reduction of both J and I. So $J = (x_1, \ldots, x_p)$. We get the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Now we will apply the above results for mixed multiplicities of ideals. Risler and Teissier in 1973 [19] defined mixed multiplicities of ideals of dimension 0 and interpreted them as the Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity of ideals generated by general elements. Katz and Verma in 1989 [10] started the investigation of mixed multiplicities of ideals of positive height. The case of arbitrary ideals, Viet in 2000 [24] described mixed multiplicities as the Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity via (FC)-sequences. In past years, the relationship between mixed multiplicities and the Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity, and the properties similar to that of the Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity have attracted much attention (see e.g. [3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37]).

Let $(A, \mathfrak{n})$ be a Noetherian local ring with the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n}$. Let $I_1, \ldots, I_s$ be ideals of A such that $I = I_1 \cdots I_s$ is non-nilpotent. Set $\dim A/0_A : I^\infty = q$. Let J be a $\mathfrak{n}$-primary ideal. Put $\mathbf{1} = (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{N}^s$; $\mathbf{k}! = k_1! \cdots k_s!$; $|\mathbf{k}| = k_1 + \cdots + k_s$; $\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{k}} = n_1^{k_1} \cdots n_s^{k_s}$ for each $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_s); \mathbf{k} = (k_1, \ldots, k_s) \in \mathbb{N}^s$ and $\mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{1}$. Moreover, set

$$\mathbf{I} = I_1, \ldots, I_s;\ \mathbf{I}^{[\mathbf{k}]} = I_1^{[k_1]}, \ldots, I_s^{[k_s]};\ \mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{n}} = I_1^{n_1} \cdots I_s^{n_s}.$$

Remember that by [24, Proposition 3.1], $\ell_A\left[\dfrac{J^{n_0}\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{n}}}{J^{n_0+1}\mathbf{I}^{\mathbf{n}}}\right]$ is a polynomial of degree $(q-1)$ for all large $n_0, \mathbf{n}$. The terms of total degree $(q-1)$ in this polynomial have the form

$$\sum_{k_0\,+|\mathbf{k}|\,=\,q-1} e(J^{[k_0+1]}, \mathbf{I}^{[\mathbf{k}]}; A)\frac{n_0^{k_0}\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{k}}}{k_0!\mathbf{k}!}.$$

Then recall that $e(J^{[k_0+1]}, \mathbf{I}^{[\mathbf{k}]}; A)$ is called the *mixed multiplicity of* $J, \mathbf{I}$ *of the type* $(k_0, \mathbf{k})$(see e,g.[6, 23]).

For statements of the next result, we would like to recall the following fact.

Remark 2.14. Let $I_1, \ldots, I_s$ be ideals in the graded ring S with $\operatorname{ht}(I_1 \cdots I_s) = h > 0$. Let $k_0, \mathbf{k}$ be non-negative integers such that $k_0 + |\mathbf{k}| = \dim S - 1$ and $|\mathbf{k}| < h$. Then since $t = |\mathbf{k}| < h$, by [24, Theorem 3.5 (ii)] or [26, Proposition 3.1 (vii)] (see e.g. [4, 5, 31, 36]), there exists a weak-(FC)-sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ of $(\mathbf{I}, \mathfrak{m})$ of the type $(\mathbf{k}, 0)$, and in this case, $\dim S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t) = d - t$ and

$$e(\mathfrak{m}^{[k_0+1]}, \mathbf{I}^{[\mathbf{k}]}; S) = e(S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t)).$$

Since $\dim S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t) = d - t$, $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ is a subsystem of parameters of S.

Then as an application of Theorem 2.11 and known results in Remark 2.14 on mixed multiplicities, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 2.15. *Let* $\mathbf{I} = I_1, \ldots, I_s$ *be ideals of* S *with* $\operatorname{ht}(I_1 \cdots I_s) = h > 0$. *Let* $k_0, \mathbf{k}$ *be non-negative integers such that* $k_0 + |\mathbf{k}| = \dim S - 1$ *and* $|\mathbf{k}| < h$. *Let* $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ *be a weak-(FC)-sequence of* $(\mathbf{I}, \mathfrak{m})$ *of the type* $(\mathbf{k}, 0)$. *Assume that* $\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_t$ *is a subsystem of parameters for S. Then we have*

$$e(\mathfrak{m}^{[k_0+1]}, \mathbf{I}^{[\mathbf{k}]}; S) = o(x_1) \cdots o(x_t)e(S).$$

Proof. Since $t = |\mathbf{k}| < h$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ is a weak-(FC)-sequence of $(\mathbf{I}, \mathfrak{m})$ of the type $(\mathbf{k}, 0)$, by Remark 2.14, we get $\dim S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t) = d - t$ and

$$e(\mathfrak{m}^{[k_0+1]}, \mathbf{I}^{[\mathbf{k}]}; S) = e(S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t)).$$

Now since $\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_t$ is also a subsystem of parameters for S,

$$\dim S/(\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_t) = d - t.$$

Hence there exist homogeneous elements of degree 1: $x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d \in \mathfrak{m}$ such that

$$(x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d)(S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t))$$

and $(x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d)(S/(\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_t))$ are minimal reductions of $\mathfrak{m}(S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t))$ and $\mathfrak{m}(S/(\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_t))$, respectively by [15]. Then

$$x_1, \ldots, x_t, x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d$$

and $\mathrm{in}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_t, \mathrm{in}x_{t+1}, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_d$ are systems of parameters of S. Hence by Theorem 2.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e(x_1, \ldots, x_t, x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d; S) &= \deg x_{t+1} \cdots \deg x_d o(x_1) \cdots o(x_t) e(S) \\ &= o(x_1) \cdots o(x_t) e(S). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ is a weak-(FC)-sequence, $x_1, \ldots, x_t$ is an I-filter-regular sequence and $t < \mathrm{ht}I$, here $I = I_1 \cdots I_s$. Hence it follows by [2] that

$$e(x_1, \ldots, x_t, x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d; S) = e(x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d; S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t)).$$

Since $e(x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d; S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t)) = e(\mathfrak{m}; S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t)) = e(S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t))$ by [15, Theorem 1], we get $e(S/(x_1, \ldots, x_t)) = e(x_1, \ldots, x_t, x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_d; S)$. Thus

$$e(\mathfrak{m}^{[k_0+1]}, \mathbf{I}^{[\mathbf{k}]}; S) = o(x_1) \cdots o(x_t) e(S).$$

□

Denote by $R(I) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} I^n$ the Rees algebra of an ideal I. Then as an application of Theorem 2.15, we obtain the following.

Corollary 2.16. *Let I be an equimultiple ideal of $\mathrm{ht}I = h > 0$. Set $\dim S = d$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ be a weak-(FC)-sequence in I of $(I, \mathfrak{m})$. Assume that $\mathrm{in}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_h$ is a subsystem of parameters for S. Then we have*

(i) *$e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = o(x_1) \cdots o(x_i) e(S)$ for all $i \leq h - 1$.*

(ii) *$e(R(I)) = (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} o(x_1) \cdots o(x_i)) e(S)$.*

Proof. Since $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ is a weak-(FC)-sequence in I of $(I, \mathfrak{m})$ and $\mathrm{in}x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in}x_i$ is a subsystem of parameters for S for all $i \leq h - 1$. By Theorem 2.15, we get

$$e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = o(x_1) \cdots o(x_i) e(S)$$

for all $i \leq h-1$. We have (i). Since I is an equimultiple ideal of $\mathrm{ht}I = h$, for any $i \geq h$, we have $e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = 0$ by [22] (see e.g. [25, 30]). So by (i) and [22, Theorem 3.1] (see e.g. [25, Theorem 3.2] or [30, Corollary 4.7 (ii)]), we get (ii). □

3 Mixed Multiplicities of Homogeneous Ideals

As applications of Section 2, in this section, we determine formulas for mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings of homogeneous equimultiple ideals in S.

Let I be a homogeneous ideal of S. An ideal J is called a *homogeneous minimal reduction* of I if J is a minimal reduction of I and J is homogeneous. I is called a *homogeneous equimultiple ideal* if there exists a homogeneous minimal reduction J of I generated by $\mathrm{ht}I$ homogeneous elements.

Now, we investigate the relationship between the degree sequence of minimal reductions of homogeneous equimultiple ideals and the degree sequence of weak-(FC)-sequences that will be used in the proof for Corollary 3.2 of this section.

Lemma 3.1. *Let I be a homogeneous equimultiple ideal of* $\operatorname{ht}I = h > 0$. *Let J be a homogeneous minimal reduction of I with the degree sequence $(c_1, \ldots, c_h)$. Then J is generated by a weak-(FC)-sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ in I of $(I, \mathfrak{m})$ such that* $\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_h$ *is a subsystem of parameters for S and*

$$(o(x_1), \ldots, o(x_h)) = (c_1, \ldots, c_h).$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.2, we can assume that $y_1, \ldots, y_h$ is a homogeneous minimal basis of J such that $y_1^*, \ldots, y_h^*$ is a minimal basis of J^*, and the degree sequences of J and J^* are $(\deg y_1, \ldots, \deg y_h) = (c_1, \ldots, c_h)$. By Lemma 2.13, J is generated by a weak-(FC)-sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ in J of $(J, \mathfrak{m})$ and this sequence is also a weak-(FC)-sequence in I of $(I, \mathfrak{m})$. Then notice that the sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_i, (x_{i+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{i} a_j x_j), \ldots, x_h$ and the sequence $u_1x_1, \ldots, u_hx_h$ are also weak-(FC)-sequences in J of $(J, \mathfrak{m})$ and $(u_1x_1, \ldots, u_ix_i) = (x_1, \ldots, x_i)$ for all $0 \neq u_1, \ldots, u_h \in k$; $a_1, \ldots, a_i \in k$ and $i \leq h$. Hence without loss of generality, we can assume that $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ are written in the following forms

$$x_j = y_{n_j} + a_{j(j+1)} y_{n_{j+1}} + \cdots + a_{jh} y_{n_h},$$

here $a_{ij} \in k$, $y_{n_1}, \ldots, y_{n_h}$ is a permutation of $y_1, \ldots, y_h$, moreover $o(x_j) = \deg y_{n_j}$; $x_j^* = y_{n_j}^*$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, h$. Set $U_i = (x_1, \ldots, x_i)$ for all $i \leq h$. Since $x_1^*, \ldots, x_i^*$ are pairwise distinct, it follows that $x_1^*, \ldots, x_i^*$ and $\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_i$ are minimal bases of U_i^* and $\operatorname{in}U_i$, respectively by Remark 2.3. In this case, $\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_h$ is a minimal basis of $\operatorname{in}U_h$. Because $U_h = J$ is a homogeneous ideal of $\operatorname{ht}I = h > 0$, $J = (\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_h)$. So $\operatorname{in}x_1, \ldots, \operatorname{in}x_h$ is a subsystem of parameters for S.

The following we will prove that $(o(x_1), \ldots, o(x_h)) = (c_1, \ldots, c_h)$.

Set $J_i = (y_{n_1}, \ldots, y_{n_i})$; $J_0 = U_0 = \{0\}$; $S_i' = S/U_i$; $S_i = S/J_i$ for all $0 \leq i \leq h-1$. Denote by x'; $\bar{x}$, J_i'; $\bar{J}_i$ and $\mathfrak{m}_i'$; $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i$ the images of $x \in S$, J and $\mathfrak{m}$ in S_i' and S_i, respectively. Since $y_1^*, \ldots, y_h^*$ is a minimal basis of J^*, it follows that $y_{n_1}^*, \ldots, y_{n_i}^*$ is a minimal basis of J_i^*. So $J_i^* = (y_{n_1}^*, \ldots, y_{n_i}^*)$. Note that x_{i+1}' is a weak-(FC)-element in J_i' of $(J_i', \mathfrak{m}_i')$, we have

$$(x_{i+1}') \bigcap \mathfrak{m}_i'^m J_i'^n = x_{i+1}' \mathfrak{m}_i'^m J_i'^{n-1}$$

for all large m, n. Since $x_{i+1}\mathfrak{m}^{m-o(x_{i+1})} \subset \mathfrak{m}^m$ for all $m \geq o(x_{i+1})$, it follows that $x_{i+1}'\mathfrak{m}_i'^{m-o(x_{i+1})} J_i'^n \subset \mathfrak{m}_i'^m J_i'^n$ for all $m \geq o(x_{i+1})$. Consequently, we obtain

$$x_{i+1}'\mathfrak{m}_i'^{m-o(x_{i+1})} J_i'^n \subset (x_{i+1}') \bigcap \mathfrak{m}_i'^m J_i'^n = x_{i+1}' \mathfrak{m}_i'^m J_i'^{n-1}$$

for all large m, n. Hence $x_{i+1}\mathfrak{m}^{m-o(x_{i+1})} J^n + U_i \subset x_{i+1}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + U_i$ for all large m, n. Therefore we get

$$o((x_{i+1}\mathfrak{m}^{m-o(x_{i+1})} J^n + U_i)^*/U_i^*) \geq o((x_{i+1}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + U_i)^*/U_i^*) \tag{2}$$

for all large m, n. Emphasize that $U_i^* = (x_1^*, \ldots, x_i^*) = (y_{n_1}^*, \ldots, y_{n_i}^*) = J_i^*$ for all $1 \leq i \leq h-1$; $U_0^* = J_0^* = \{0\}$ and $x_i^* = y_{n_i}^*$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, h$, first of all we have

$$(x_{i+1}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + U_i)^*/U_i^* = (y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i)^*/J_i^*. \tag{3}$$

Next, we need to show that

$$o\big(y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i/J_i\big) = o\big((y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i)^*/J_i^*\big). \tag{4}$$

Indeed, the case of $i = 0$ is true by Proposition 2.2 (iii). For $1 \leq i \leq h-1$, since $y_{n_1}, \ldots, y_{n_i}$ is a part of a minimal basis of J and

$$(y_{n_1}, \ldots, y_{n_i}) = J_i \subset y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i \subset J,$$

it follows that $y_{n_1}, \ldots, y_{n_i}$ is a part of a minimal basis of $y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i$. Moreover $i < \operatorname{ht} J$ and $y_{n_1}^*, \ldots, y_{n_i}^*$ are pairwise distinct, there exist j elements for a certain integer $j > 0$

$$f_1, \ldots, f_j \in y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i$$

such that $f_1, \ldots, f_j, y_{n_1}, \ldots, y_{n_i}$ is a minimal basis of $y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i$ and

$$f_1^*, \ldots, f_j^*, y_{n_1}^*, \ldots, y_{n_i}^*$$

are pairwise distinct (see the proof of Proposition 2.2). Therefore $f_1^*, \ldots, f_j^*, y_{n_1}^*, \ldots, y_{n_i}^*$ is a minimal basis of $(y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i)^*$ by Remark 2.3. Then it is easily seen that

$$o\big(y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i/J_i\big) = o(\{f_1, \ldots, f_j\})$$

and $o\big((y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i)^*/J_i^*\big) = o(\{f_1^*, \ldots, f_j^*\})$. Consequently we have (4).

Note that $y_{n_{i+1}}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + J_i/J_i = \bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i^m \bar{J}_i^{n-1}$, hence we obtain

$$o\big((x_{i+1}\mathfrak{m}^m J^{n-1} + U_i)^*/U_i^*\big) = o(\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i^m \bar{J}_i^{n-1})$$

by (3) and (4). And likewise,

$$o\big((x_{i+1}\mathfrak{m}^{m-o(x_{i+1})} J^n + U_i)^*/U_i^*\big) = o(\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i^{m-o(x_{i+1})} \bar{J}_i^n).$$

Consequently,

$$o(\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i^{m-o(x_{i+1})} \bar{J}_i^n) \geq o(\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i^m \bar{J}_i^{n-1})$$

for all large m, n by (2). Recall that $o(x_i) = \deg y_{n_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq h$. Moreover, we have $\deg y_{n_j} = \deg \bar{y}_{n_j}$ for all $i+1 \leq j \leq h$. Since I is a homogeneous equimultiple ideal, $y_1, \ldots, y_h$ is a subsystem of homogeneous parameters. From this it follows that $\bar{J}_i$ is generated by a subsystem of homogeneous parameters in S_i, and $\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}} \in \bar{J}_i$ is an element of homogeneous parameters. Because a subsystem of parameters for S_i is algebraically independent over k (see e.g. [1, Corollary 11.21]), we get

$$o(\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i^m \bar{J}_i^n) = \deg \bar{y}_{n_{i+1}} + m + n.o(\bar{J}_i)$$

for all $m, n > 0$. Therefore it can easily be seen that

$$m + n.o(\bar{J}_i) = o(\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i^{m-o(x_{i+1})} \bar{J}_i^n) \geq o(\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_i^m \bar{J}_i^{n-1}) = m + \deg \bar{y}_{n_{i+1}} + (n-1)o(\bar{J}_i)$$

for all large m, n. So $o(\bar{J}_i) \geq \deg \bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}$. Note that we always have $o(\bar{J}_i) \leq \deg \bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}$, consequently $o(\bar{J}_i) = \deg \bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}$. Remember that

$$\bar{J}_i = J/J_i = (\bar{y}_{n_{i+1}}, \ldots, \bar{y}_{n_h})$$

and $\deg \bar{y}_{n_{i+1}} = \deg y_{n_{i+1}}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq h-1$, hence $o(\{y_{n_{i+1}}, \ldots, y_{n_h}\}) = \deg y_{n_{i+1}}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq h-1$. From this it follows that $\deg y_{n_1} \leq \cdots \leq \deg y_{n_h}$. So

$$(\deg y_{n_1}, \ldots, \deg y_{n_h})$$

is the degree sequence of J, i.e., $(\deg y_{n_1}, \ldots, \deg y_{n_h}) = (c_1, \ldots, c_h)$. Then we get $(o(x_1), \ldots, o(x_h)) = (c_1, \ldots, c_h)$ because $o(x_i) = \deg y_{n_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq h$. □

The following theorem answers to the question (see Question 1) on determining mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings of homogeneous ideals generated by arbitrary subsystems of parameters.

Corollary 3.2. *Let I be a homogeneous equimultiple ideal in S of* $\mathrm{ht} I = h > 0$. *Let $(a_1, \ldots, a_h)$ be the degree sequence of a homogeneous minimal reduction of I. Set $\dim S = d$. Then we have:*

(i) $e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = a_1 \cdots a_i e(S)$ *for all $i \leq h-1$.*

(ii) $e(R(I)) = (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{h-1} a_1 \cdots a_i) e(S)$.

Proof. Let J be a homogeneous minimal reduction of I generated by homogeneous elements of the degree sequence $(a_1, \ldots, a_h)$. By Lemma 3.1, there exists a weak-(FC)-sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ in I of $(I, \mathfrak{m})$ such that $\mathrm{in} x_1, \ldots, \mathrm{in} x_h$ is a subsystem of parameters for S and $(o(x_1), \ldots, o(x_h)) = (a_1, \ldots, a_h)$. Hence by Corollary 2.16, we get the proof of this corollary. □

Remark 3.3. Corollary 3.2 is also Theorem 3.1 given by Viet in [27]. Recall that the proof of [27] is based on the existence of homogeneous weak-(FC)-sequences in I as in [27, Note 1]. However, this is not correct because in general there does not exist a homogeneous weak-(FC)-sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ as the statements in Lemma 3.1 by the Remark of Lemma 1.4 [20]. So by another approach, the paper showed that Theorem 3.1 and hence the other results on mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings in [27] are true. So Question 1 has a positive answer.

Theorem 3.2 covered [20, Theorem 3.3] and [8, Theorem 3.6] that [8, 20] studied this problem in the case that I is a homogeneous ideal generated by a subsystem of parameters $x_1, \ldots, x_h$ which is an I-filer-regular sequence with $\deg x_1 \leq \cdots \leq \deg x_h$.

Moreover, the following result will show the decision of the degree sequence for mixed multiplicities and multiplicities of Rees rings of homogeneous equimultiple ideals in graded rings.

Corollary 3.4. *Let I and E be homogeneous equimultiple ideals of S. Suppose that homogeneous minimal reductions of I and E have the same degree sequence. Then* $e(R(I)) = e(R(E))$ *and* $e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, E^{[i]}; S)$ *for all* $i \leq h-1$.

Proof. Let $(x_1, \ldots, x_h)$ and $(y_1, \ldots, y_h)$ be homogeneous minimal reductions of I and E with the degree sequences $\deg x_1 \leq \cdots \leq \deg x_h$ and $\deg y_1 \leq \cdots \leq \deg y_h$, respectively. From the assumption we deduce that $\deg x_i = \deg y_i$ for all $i \leq h$. So by Corollary 3.2 we get $e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, E^{[i]}; S)$ for all $i \leq h-1$ and $e(R(I)) = e(R(E))$. $\square$

Remark 3.5. Note that for any equimultiple ideal I of $\mathrm{ht}I = h$, for any $i \geq h$, we have $e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = 0$ by [22] (see e.g. [25, 30]). Moreover, by Corollary 3.2, it follows that if $(a_1, \ldots, a_h)$ and $(b_1, \ldots, b_h)$ are the degree sequences of homogeneous minimal reductions of homogeneous equimultiple ideals I and E, respectively, then $e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, I^{[i]}; S) = e(\mathfrak{m}^{[d-i]}, E^{[i]}; S)$ for all i if and only if $a_i = b_i$ for all $i \leq h-1$.

References

[1] M. F. Atiyah, I. G. MacDonald, *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison Wesley, Massachusetts 1969.

[2] M. Auslander, D. Buchsbaum, *Codimension and multiplicity*, Ann. Math. 68 (1958).

[3] R. Callejas-Bedregal, V. H. Jorge Perez, *Mixed multiplicities and the minimal number of generator of modules*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 214 (2010), 1642-1653.

[4] L. V. Dinh, N. T. Manh, T. T. H. Thanh, *On some superficial sequences*, Southeast Asian Bull. Math. Vol. 38(6) (2014), 803-811.

[5] L. V. Dinh, D. Q. Viet, *On two results of mixed multiplicities*, Int. J. Algebra 4(1) 2010, 19-23.

[6] M. Herrmann, E. Hyry, J. Ribbe, Z. Tang, *Reduction numbers and multiplicities of multigraded structures*, J. Algebra 197 (1997), 311-341.

[7] J. Herzog, N. V. Trung, B. Ulrich, *On the multiplicity of blow-up rings of ideals generated by d-sequences*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 80 (1992), 273-297.

[8] N. D. Hoang, *On mixed multiplicities of homogeneous ideaks*, Beitrage Algebra Geom. 42 (2001), 463-473.

[9] C. Huneke, I. Swanson, *Integral Closure of Ideals, Rings, and Modules*, London Mathematical Lecture Note Series 336, Cambridge University Press (2006).

[10] D. Katz, J. K. Verma, *Extended Rees algebras and mixed multiplicities*, Math. Z. 202 (1989), 111-128.

[11] D. Kirby, D. Rees, *Multiplicities in graded rings I: the general theory*, Contemporary Mathematics 159 (1994), 209-267.

[12] D. Kirby, D. Rees, *Multiplicities in graded rings II: integral equivalence and the Buchsbaum-Rim multiplicity*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. 119 (1996), 425-445.

[13] S. Kleiman, A. Thorup, *Mixed Buchsbaum-Rim multiplicities*, Amer. J. Math. 118 (1996), 529-569.

[14] N. T. Manh, D. Q. Viet, *Mixed multiplicities of modules over noetherian local rings*, Tokyo J. Math. Vol. 29. No. 2, (2006), 325-345.

[15] D. G. Northcott, D. Rees, *Reduction of ideals in local rings*, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. 50 (1954), 145-158.

[16] D. Rees, *Generalizations of reductions and mixed multiplicities*, J. London. Math. Soc. 29 (1984), 397-414.

[17] P. Roberts, *Local Chern classes, multiplicities and perfect complexes*, Memoire Soc. Math. France 38 (1989), 145-161.

[18] I. Swanson, *Mixed multiplicities, joint reductions and quasi-unmixed local rings*, J. London Math. Soc. 48 (1993), no.1, 1-14.

[19] B. Teisier, *Cycles èvanescents, sections planes, et conditions de Whitney*, Singularities à Cargése, 1972. Astérisque, 7-8 (1973), 285-362.

[20] N. V. Trung, *Filter-regular sequences and multiplicity of blow-up rings of ideals of the principal class*, J. Math. Kyoto. Univ. 33 (1993), 665-683.

[21] N. V. Trung, J. Verma, *Hilbert functions of multigraded algebras, mixed multiplicities of ideals and their applications*, J. Commut. Algebra. 2 (2010), 515-565.

[22] J. K. Verma, *Rees algebras and mixed multiplicities*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 104 (1988), 1036-1044.

[23] J. K. Verma, *Multigraded Rees algebras and mixed multiplicities*, J. Pure and Appl. Algebra 77 (1992), 219-228.

[24] D. Q. Viet, *Mixed multiplicities of arbitrary ideals in local rings*, Comm. Algebra. 28 (8) (2000), 3803-3821.

[25] D. Q. Viet, *On some properties of (FC)-sequences of ideals in local ring*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 131 (2003), 45-53.

[26] D. Q. Viet, *Sequences determining mixed multiplicities and reductions of ideals*, Comm. Algebra 31 (10) (2003), 5047-5069.

[27] D. Q. Viet, *On the mixed multiplicity and the multiplicity of blow-up rings of equimultiple ideals*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 183 (2003), 313-327.

[28] D. Q. Viet, *Reductions and Mixed multiplicities of ideals*, Comm. Algebra 32 (11) (2004), 4159-4178.

[29] D. Q. Viet, *On the Cohen-Macaulayness of fiber cones*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.136 (2008), 4185-4195.

[30] D. Q. Viet, L. V. Dinh, *On the multiplicity of Rees algebras of good filtrations*, Kyushu J. Math. 66 (2012), 261-272.

[31] D. Q. Viet, L. V. Dinh, *On mixed multiplicities of good filtrations*, Algebra Colloqium 22:3 (2015) 421-436.

[32] D. Q. Viet, L. V. Dinh, T. T. H. Thanh, *A note on joint reductions and mixed multiplicities*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 142 (2014), 1861-1873.

[33] D. Q. Viet, N. T. Manh, *Mixed multiplicities of multigraded modules*, Forum Math. 25 (2013), 337-361.

[34] D. Q. Viet, T. T. H. Thanh, *The multiplicity of some blow-up algebras of equimultiple ideals*, Int. J. Algebra 4(5) 2010, 221-232.

[35] D. Q. Viet, T. T. H. Thanh, *Multiplicity and Cohen-Macaulayness of fiber cones of good filtrations*, Kyushu J. Math. 65 (2011), 1-13.

[36] D. Q. Viet, T. T. H. Thanh, *On* (FC)*-sequences and mixed multiplicities of multigraded algebras*, Tokyo J. Math. 34 (2011), 185-202.

[37] D. Q. Viet, T. T. H. Thanh, *On some multiplicity and mixed multiplicity formulas*, Forum Math. 26 (2014), 413-442.